

Valle De Oro Community Planning Group  
P.O. Box 3958  
La Mesa, CA 91944-3958

m/o 1/23  
**RECEIVED**  
JAN 23 2009

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING  
AND LAND USE

**Minutes of meeting:** January 6, 2009

**Location:** Otay Water District Headquarters  
2554 Sweetwater Springs Blvd.  
Training Room, Lower Terrace

**1. Call to order:** 7:00 PM J.L. PHILLIPS, presiding Chair

Members present: Brennan, Brownlee, Chapman, Feathers, Fitchett, Henderson, Hewicker, Hyatt, Manning, Mitrovich, Phillips, Reith, Ripperger, Wollitz

Not present: Millar,

**2. Finalize Agenda:** As shown

**3. Open Forum:** None

**4. Approval of minutes:** Minutes of December 16, 2008 **VOTE: 12-0-2** to approve.  
Abstained: Reith, Ripperger

**5. Land Use**

a. Rancho San Diego Sheriff's Station: Proposal to locate 25,000 sq. ft. station and parking for 162 vehicles on 13.85 acres on the north side of Campo Road/SR-94 between the Skyline Wesleyan Church (11330 Campo Road) and the equipment storage yard along SR-94 east of the Skyline Church. Copies of the Mitigated Negative Declaration available by calling (858) 974-2237 (Jody).

The project was introduced by Chairman PHILLIPS who asked everyone to review the adhoc subcommittee comments. Jody Mays, 9621 Ridgehaven Court in San Diego, a Project Manager with the Sheriff's Department then introduced Lieutenant GiGi McCalla of the Lemon Grove Sheriff's Station, Dahvia Lynch a Project Manger with DGS and Patrick O'Neill with BRG. Jody stated that the project will be bid as a Design/Build project at which time the aesthetics, site plan, building elevations, footprint definition, biology and other factors will be considered and developed. PHILLIPS commented that he wanted the ad hoc committee and the community involved in the design of the facility. O'Neill mentioned that he had spoken to Armstrong from Caltrans concerning the grade separation in the area and that Armstrong said there were no plans for it. PHILLIPS responded that County Public Works has recognized the need for a grade separation due to the LOS F. The Jamacha Junction intersection was reviewed during the Skyline Church project review in regards to the westbound 94 to westbound Campo Road flyover. No date for work was determined at that time. WOLLITZ asked if the proposed site was once designated as open space.

Jody responded that the development envelope identified open space. MANNING asked about the projected 1000ADT and the time of the shifts. McCalla replied that the 6 or 7 administration staff works at peak hours but that the majority of the staff is deputies. They need the large number of parking spaces for the deputies which is between 10 -12 at any given time who need to park their personal and work cars on-site. Additionally the 2 shifts have ½ hour de-briefing overlap between the 6 AM and 6 PM shifts. The Lemon Grove station has 2-3 units per shift. HENDERSON asked how the Planning Group and the community will be involved with the project. It appears that there will be no community oriented policing. Lemon Grove is far from the center of the unincorporated area whereas this location is central. McCalla, a 20 year veteran, said that this is an ideal location for the station due to a potentially quicker response time. She acknowledged the benefits of the Rancho San Diego and Spring Valley storefronts that are open 7/24. Detectives, civilian staff, a captain and a lieutenant will be in the new station while the rest of the staff will be in the field. PHILLIPS stated that the Planning Group's involvement was described as non- applicable in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Planning Group needs to be involved with the design of the facility. He made reference to the blighted lot next to the proposed site as an example of past County decision making. Jody asked how to get the Planning Group involved in the Design/Build process and their objectives and goals in terms of the design of the architecture and landscaping. CHAPMAN responded that the D- Designator is the only control that the Planning Group can have where they can't "blow us off". PHILLIPS stated that the mitigation developed for aesthetics, etc., should be by the Planning Group providing bottom line goals and project proposal reviews. The Neg Dec needs to recognize that aesthetics aren't that minor. O'Neill acknowledged that they will give us assurance that the Planning Group can establish conditions which must be met. PHILLIPS stated that there are no aesthetics in this report at this time for us to review since it really isn't described. O'Neill acknowledged the importance of the architectural design issue concerning the Planning Group's input. PHILLIPS commented that the only thing that would push the Group into requiring an EIR is the grade separation issue. Jody stated that they can design a functional building and meet the Group's aesthetics as well. She confirmed that the building will meet the LEED Silver equivalent. FITCHETT moved to adopt the subcommittee report as the Group's position. (CHAPMAN seconds). The report will be considered as formal comments and the County must respond and forward them to General Services and the Board of Supervisors. HYATT asked how can they have a Mitigated Neg Dec if there is a grade separation? PHILLIPS responded that the Church entry was designed so that it wouldn't conflict with a future grade separation (flyover). Jody noted that the Otay Water pipeline issues were resolved by the proposed relocation of the line at the cost of \$150,000 to \$180,000. HENDERSON questioned that Caltrans was not aware of the grade separation. Attendee Jim Schmidt 11038 Horizon Hills El Cajon stated that Caltrans and SANDAG will adequately address any transportation issues. PHILLIPS stated that they still need to provide full ramps at the 94/125

interchange. **VOTE: 14-0-0** to adopt the subcommittee report as the Planning Group's position.

**6. New Business:** None

**7. Unfinished Business:** None

**8. Chairman's Report:** Caltrans new Grant Cycle information is available

**9. Election of Officers:** BRENNAN moves to continue the term of the officers in office by acclamation with PHILLIPS as Chairman, FITCHETT as Vice Chair and FEATHERS as Secretary. (HENDERSON seconds.) **VOTE: 14-0-0**

**10. Adjournment:** 7:55 PM

Submitted by: Jösan Feathers

**VALLE DE ORO COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP  
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT RE  
RANCHO SAN DIEGO SHERIFF'S STATION PROJECT  
JANUARY 6, 2009**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

The ad hoc committee recognizes the long-standing need for a Sheriff's station centrally located in the Valle de Oro Planning Area. This project location appears to fulfill that need, but the location is also an important open-space aesthetic resource separating two Rancho San Diego villages (Avocado Village and Monte Vista Village). We are deeply concerned that the County's General Services Department will not understand or honor the importance of this aesthetic resource based on their allowing the creation of visual blight while managing the equally important property bordering this site. Exclusion of the community planning group from participating in the design process is further basis for our concerns.

Except for possible interference with future grade separation of key intersections to relieve severe traffic congestion, we believe that a 25,000 square foot sheriff's station can be appropriately designed to both serve the Sheriff's needs and be sensitive to the aesthetic resource value of the site. To this end, the planning group is committed to participating when and where necessary to expedite development of an acceptable site plan.

Our comments and concerns regarding the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration are as follows:

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION:**

**Pg. 2 Item 7:** Claims "D" designator is "Not Applicable". This zoning designator requires formal site plan submittal and review/approval.

**INITIAL STUDY:**

**I. "Aesthetics" a, c, & d (Pgs. 20-22):** Claims "Less than Significant Impact" on a scenic vista and existing visual character. Project is in the scenic corridor of SR-94. The level of aesthetic impacts cannot be determined for I. a, c, or d without disclosure of the building design and a site plan with landscape and lighting details. Therefore, items I. a, c, & d are all "Potentially Significant Impact" given the current status of the project and its documentation.

The required site plan ("D" designator) must be submitted for community review/approval prior to claiming "Less than Significant Impact" in a Negative Declaration.

**VIII. "Hydrology and Water Quality" e. (Pgs. 56,57):** Claims "Less than Significant Impact" to erosion or siltation, but does not require mitigation of the increase in flow rates that could impact downstream waters. Having options under consideration does not constitute mitigation of a potentially significant impact. This item should be changed to "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" and a mitigation selected and shown on the grading plan and the required site plan and associated landscape plan.

**IX. "Land Use and Planning" b. (Pg. 61):** Claims "No Impact" for conflicts with applicable land-use regulation. The project is in direct conflict with the site's zoning requirement ("D" designator) for the submittal, review, and approval of a detailed site plan for the project. Only through this process can the project design be deemed successful in mitigating aesthetic and hydrology impacts. Given the current status of the project, this item should be "Potentially Significant Impact."

**XV. "Transportation/Traffic" a. (Pg. 69):** This item should address whether the project location/design will interfere with future full grade separation or partial grade separation at the Jamacha Rd/SR-94 and Jamacha Blvd/SR-94 intersections. Due to Level-of-Service "F" congestion at these intersections, these grade-separation improvements are recommended in the General Plan Update Mobility Element.